arXiv:1611.03694v1 [math.AP] 11 Nov 2016

Analysis of a mathematical model for tumor growth with Gibbs-Thomson relation

Junde Wu

Department of Mathematics, Soochow University, Suzhou,
Jiangsu 215006, PR China, E-mail: wujund@suda.edu.cn

Abstract

In this paper we study a mathematical model for the growth of nonnecrotic solid tumor. The tumor is assumed to be radially symmetric and its radius $R(t)$ is an unknown function of time t as tumor growth, and the model is in the form of a free boundary problem. The feature of the model is that a Gibbs-Thomson relation is taken into account, which resulting an interesting phenomenon that there exist two stationary solutions (depending on the model parameters). The global existence and uniqueness of solution are established. By denoting c the ratio of the diffusion time scale to the tumor doubling time scale, we prove that for sufficiently small $c > 0$, the stationary solution with the larger radius is asymptotically stable, and the other smaller one is unstable.

2010 Mathematics Subject Classification: 35B40, 35Q92, 35R35

Keywords: free boundary problem; tumor growth; global existence; asymptotic behavior

1 Introduction

In the last several decades, great attention has been attracted to mathematical models of tumor growth for their own both biological and mathematical interests, cf. [7, 11–13] and references therein. Mathematical analysis of these models can help us understanding the mechanism of tumor growth and accessing tumor treatment strategy. On the other hand, a lot of mathematical challenges arise in tumor models, and many interesting and illuminative results have been established, cf. [3–10, 15, 16, 18] and references therein.

In this paper we study a tumor model in the form of a free boundary problem. Since solid tumors grow with spheroid-shaped, tumor region is assumed to be a spheroid with radius $R(t)$ at time $t > 0$, the proliferation of tumor cells is assumed to be dependent only on located concentration of nutrient $\sigma(r, t)$, which is diffusing within tumor region, and tumor growth is governed by the mass conservation law. The model considered here is given as follows:

$$c\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial t} = \frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big(r^2\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial r}\Big) - \lambda\sigma \qquad \text{for } r < R(t), \quad t > 0, \tag{1.1}$$

$$\frac{\partial \sigma}{\partial r}(0,t)=0, \qquad \sigma(R(t),t)=G(t) \qquad \text{for } t>0, \tag{1.2}$$

$$\frac{dR}{dt}=\frac{1}{R^2}\int_0^R \mu(\sigma-\tilde{\sigma})r^2 dr \qquad \text{for } t>0, \tag{1.3}$$

$$\sigma(r,0)=\sigma_0(r) \qquad \text{for } 0\le r\le R_0, \tag{1.4}$$

$$R(0)=R_0. \tag{1.5}$$

where c, λ, $\tilde{\sigma}$, μ are positive dimensionless constants, among which c is the ratio of the nutrient diffusion time scale ($\sim$ minutes) to the tumor doubling time scale ($\sim$ days), and $c \ll 1$; λ is the nutrient consumption rate; $\tilde{\sigma}$ is a threshold value of nutrient concentration for apoptosis; μ is the proliferation rate of tumor cells; $G(t)$ is a given function representing the external nutrient supply; $\sigma_0(r)$ and R_0 are the given initial data.

In Byrne and Chaplain [1], the external nutrient concentration is assumed to be constant $\bar{\sigma}$, i.e., $G(t)=\bar{\sigma}$. In this case, Friedman and Reitich [10] proved that the tumor model (1.1)–(1.5) has a unique radially symmetric stationary solution for $0<\tilde{\sigma}<\bar{\sigma}$, and it is asymptotically stable for sufficiently small c. Later, Cui [3] extended the result to the inhibitor-presence case and Cui [4] further investigated the above model with general nutrient consumption function and cell proliferation function. Recently, Xu [17] considered the case that $G(t)$ is given by a periodic function, global well-posedness and some asymptotic behavior of solutions were derived.

One disadvantage of above assumptions on $G(t)$ is that though the nutrient is continuous across the tumor boundary, but the flux of nutrient is not. By contrast, Byrne and Chaplain [2] assumed that energy is expended in maintaining the tumor's compactness by cell-to-cell adhesion on tumor boundary and the nutrient acts as a source of energy, so the nutrient concentration on the tumor boundary is less than the external supply $\bar{\sigma}$, and the difference satisfies a Gibbs-Thomson relation, i.e., the difference of nutrient concentration across the tumor boundary $r=R(t)$ is proportional to the mean curvature which is given by $1/R(t)$. More precisely, Byrne and Chaplain [2] assumed that $G(t)=\bar{\sigma}(1-\gamma/R(t))$, where γ is a positive constant representing the cell-to-cell adhesiveness. In quasi-stationary case $c=0$ and replacing $\lambda\sigma$ by λ of equation (1.1), Byrne and Chaplain [2] studied existence and uniqueness of solution and the linear stability of stationary solutions, numerical verification was also performed.

Roose, Chapman and Maini [13] pointed out that the tumor model (1.1)–(1.5) with $G(t)=\bar{\sigma}(1-\gamma/R(t))$, which is induced by Gibbs-Thomson relation, has a number of interesting points. Though it seems speculative, but it may be possible to check its veracity in experiment. It is significant to analyze how the Gibbs-Thomson relation effects the growth of tumors, which can be also tested in experiments and clinical laboratory. Note that for any positive constant γ, if $R(t)<\gamma$, then $G(t)=\bar{\sigma}(1-\gamma/R(t))<0$. It is unreasonable since the nutrient concentration must be always nonnegative. For this reason, we introduce a simple modification and let

$$G(t)=\bar{\sigma}(1-\gamma/R(t))H(R(t)), \tag{1.6}$$

where $H(\cdot)$ is a smooth function such that $H(r)=0$ for $r\le\gamma$, $H(r)=1$ for $r\ge 2\gamma$, and $0\le H'(r)\le 1/\gamma$. In this paper, we shall make a rigorous analysis of problem (1.1)–(1.5) with $G(t)$ given by (1.6), and study the effect of Gibbs-Thomson relation.

In Section 2, we shall prove the global existence and uniqueness of solution, based on a priori estimate and fixed point method. In Section 3, we study the quasi-stationary case $c = 0$. We shall prove that there may exist two, or a unique, or none radially symmetric stationary solutions depending on model parameters. It is interesting that there may exist two radially symmetric stationary solutions, which is different from the uniqueness of stationary solution for constant $G(t) = \bar{\sigma}$ in [10] and periodic function $G(t)$ in [17]. By the linearized stability principle, we shall see that in quasi-stationary case $c = 0$, the radially symmetric stationary solution with the larger radius is asymptotically stable and the other smaller one is unstable.

In Section 4 we study fully non-stationary case $c > 0$. By using a comparison method and some analysis techniques motivated by [3, 4, 10], we shall prove that for sufficiently small $c > 0$, the same stability results still hold as the quasi-stationary case $c = 0$. In the last section, we make a conclusion and give some interesting biological implications.

2 Global existence and uniqueness

In this section we study global existence and uniqueness of problem (1.1)–(1.6). Throughout this paper we assume that the initial data $\sigma_0(r)$ and R_0 satisfy the following conditions:

$$R_0 > 0; \quad \sigma_0(r) \in C^2[0, R_0], \quad 0 \le \sigma_0(r) \le \bar{\sigma}, \quad \sigma_0'(0) = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_0(R_0) = G(0). \tag{2.1}$$

Theorem 2.1 Problem (1.1)–(1.6) has a unique solution $(\sigma(r,t), R(t))$ for all $t > 0$, and there hold following assertions:

$$0 \le \sigma(r,t) \le \bar{\sigma} \qquad \text{for } \ 0 \le r \le R(t), \ \ t \ge 0, \tag{2.2}$$

$$-\frac{1}{3}\mu\tilde{\sigma} \le \frac{R'(t)}{R(t)} \le \frac{1}{3}\mu(\bar{\sigma} - \tilde{\sigma}) \qquad \text{for } \ t \ge 0, \tag{2.3}$$

$$R_0 \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\mu\tilde{\sigma}t) < R(t) \le R_0 \exp(\frac{1}{3}\mu(\bar{\sigma} - \tilde{\sigma})t) \qquad \text{for } \ t \ge 0. \tag{2.4}$$

Proof. We first assume that $(\sigma(r,t), R(t))$ is a solution of problem (1.1)–(1.6). By the maximum principle, we immediately have $0 \le \sigma(r,t) \le \bar{\sigma}$ for $0 \le r \le R(t)$, $t > 0$.

By (1.3),

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \frac{1}{R^2(t)} \int_0^{R(t)} \mu(\sigma(r,t) - \tilde{\sigma}) r^2 dr,$$

we have

$$-\frac{1}{3}\mu\tilde{\sigma} \le \frac{R'(t)}{R(t)} \le \frac{1}{3}\mu(\bar{\sigma} - \tilde{\sigma}),$$

then (2.3) and (2.4) follow obviously.

Next, we prove the existence and uniqueness of solution to the problem. For arbitrary $T > 0$, we introduce a metric space (M_T, d) as follows: The set M_T consists of vector functions $(\sigma(r,t), R(t))$ which satisfy

(i) $R \in C[0,T]$, $R(0) = R_0$, and

$$R_0 \exp(-\frac{1}{3}\mu\tilde{\sigma}t) \le R(t) \le R_0 \exp(\frac{1}{3}\mu(\bar{\sigma} - \tilde{\sigma})t) \qquad \text{for } 0 < t \le T.$$

(ii) $\sigma \in C([0,\infty) \times [0,T])$, and

$$\begin{aligned} &0 \le \sigma(r,t) \le \bar{\sigma} \qquad \text{for } 0 \le r \le R(t),\ 0 < t \le T, \\ &\sigma(R(t),t) = \bar{\sigma}(1 - \frac{\gamma}{R(t)})H(R(t)) \qquad \text{for } 0 < t \le T, \\ &\sigma(r,0) = \sigma_0(r) \qquad \text{for } 0 \le r \le R_0. \end{aligned}$$

The metric d is defined by

$$d((\sigma_1,R_1),(\sigma_2,R_2)) = \max_{r\ge 0, 0\le t\le T} |\sigma_1(r,t) - \sigma_2(r,t)| + \max_{0\le t\le T} |R_1(t) - R_2(t)|.$$

It is clear that (M_T, d) is a complete metric space. For a given $(\sigma, R) \in M_T$, let $\hat{R}$ be the solution of the following initial value problem

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{d\hat{R}}{dt} = \dfrac{\hat{R}}{R^3}\displaystyle\int_0^R \mu(\sigma - \tilde{\sigma})r^2 dr \qquad \text{for } 0 \le t \le T, \\ \hat{R}(0) = R_0. \end{cases}$$

Clearly,

$$\hat{R}(t) = R_0 \exp(\int_0^t K(\tau)d\tau), \qquad K(t) = \frac{1}{R^3(t)}\int_0^{R(t)} \mu(\sigma - \tilde{\sigma})r^2 dr.$$

Since $0 \le \sigma(r,t) \le \bar{\sigma}$, we see that $-\frac{1}{3}\mu\tilde{\sigma} \le K(t) \le \frac{1}{3}\mu(\bar{\sigma} - \tilde{\sigma})$ and so that $\hat{R}$ satisfies condition (i). Next, we consider the following problem

$$\begin{cases} c\dfrac{\partial\hat{\sigma}}{\partial t} = \dfrac{1}{r^2}\dfrac{\partial}{\partial r}\Big(r^2\dfrac{\partial\hat{\sigma}}{\partial r}\Big) - \lambda\hat{\sigma} \qquad \text{for } 0 < r < \hat{R}(t),\ 0 < t \le T, \\ \dfrac{\partial\hat{\sigma}}{\partial r}(0,t) = 0, \qquad \hat{\sigma}(\hat{R}(t),t) = \hat{G}(t) \qquad \text{for } 0 < t \le T, \\ \hat{\sigma}(r,0) = \sigma_0(r) \qquad \text{for } 0 \le r \le R_0. \end{cases} \tag{2.5}$$

where $\hat{G}(t) = \bar{\sigma}(1 - \gamma/\hat{R}(t))H(\hat{R}(t)) \in C[0,T]$. By letting $u(y,t) = \hat{\sigma}(\hat{R}(t)y, t)$, it is equivalent to the following problem

$$\begin{cases} c\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial t} = \dfrac{1}{\hat{R}^2(t)y^2}\dfrac{\partial}{\partial y}\Big(y^2\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial y}\Big) + \dfrac{c\hat{R}'(t)}{\hat{R}(t)}y\dfrac{\partial u}{\partial y} - \lambda u \qquad \text{for } 0 < y < 1,\ 0 < t \le T, \\ \dfrac{\partial u}{\partial y}(0,t) = 0, \qquad u(1,t) = \hat{G}(t) \qquad \text{for } 0 < t \le T, \\ u(y,0) = \sigma_0(R_0 y) \qquad \text{for } 0 \le y \le 1. \end{cases} \tag{2.6}$$

Since all coefficients of the above differential equations are bounded, thus by a standard theory of parabolic equations, we see that there exists a unique solution $u(y,t) \in C([0,1]\times[0,T])$. We extend $u(y,t)$ such that $u(y,t) = \hat{G}(t)$ for $y \geq 1$, $0 \leq t \leq T$, and get a corresponding $\hat{\sigma}$. By comparison, we have $0 \leq \hat{\sigma}(r,t) \leq \bar{\sigma}$ and condition (ii) is satisfied. Hence for small $T > 0$, we can define a mapping $W : M_T \to M_T$ such that

$$W(\sigma, R) = (\hat{\sigma}, \hat{R}).$$

By a similar analysis of [4], we can further show that W is a contraction mapping on M_T for sufficiently small T. Then by Banach fixed point theorem, we get the local existence and uniqueness of problem (1.1)–(1.6).

Finally, since (2.2) and (2.3) do not depend on initial data $\sigma_0(r)$ and R_0, we can extend the solution to all $t > 0$. $\square$

3 Quasi-stationary case $c = 0$

In this section we study quasi-stationary case $c = 0$ of free boundary problem (1.1)–(1.6). For simplification of notations, by a rescaling argument, we always set $\lambda = \bar{\sigma} = 1$ later on.

First, we study radially symmetric stationary solution which is denoted by $(\sigma_s(r), R_s)$ for $R_s > 0$. It is easy to see that

$$\sigma_s(r) = (1 - \frac{\gamma}{R_s})\frac{R_s \sinh r}{r \sinh R_s} H(R_s). \tag{3.1}$$

Substituting it into the right term of equation (1.3) and by using the relation $\dfrac{dR_s}{dt} = 0$, we see $R_s > 0$ satisfies

$$\Big(1 - \frac{\gamma}{R_s}\Big)\frac{R_s \coth R_s - 1}{R_s^2} H(R_s) - \frac{1}{3}\tilde{\sigma} = 0. \tag{3.2}$$

Denote

$$f(r) := (1 - \frac{\gamma}{r})\frac{r \coth r - 1}{r^2} \quad \text{and} \quad F(r) := 3f(r)H(r) \quad \text{for } r > 0. \tag{3.3}$$

Thus $R_s > 0$ is the root of the equation $F(r) = \tilde{\sigma}$.

It is easy to verify that

$$F(r)\begin{cases} = 0, & \text{for } 0 < r \leq \gamma, \\ > 0, & \text{for } r > \gamma, \end{cases} \qquad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r\to+\infty} F(r) = 0. \tag{3.4}$$

Moreover, by the proof of Theorem 1.1 in [14], we see that $F(r)$ has a unique extremum point $r_\# \in (2\gamma, 2\gamma + 2)$ such that

$$F'(r)\begin{cases} > 0, & \text{for } 0 < r < r_\#, \\ = 0, & \text{for } r = r_\#, \\ < 0, & \text{for } r > r_\#, \end{cases} \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$0 < \theta_* := F(r_\#) = \max_{r>0} F(r) < 1. \tag{3.6}$$

It immediately follows that:

(i) If $\tilde{\sigma} > \theta_*$, then equation $F(r) = \tilde{\sigma}$ has no positive solution;

(ii) If $\tilde{\sigma} = \theta_*$, then equation $F(r) = \tilde{\sigma}$ has a unique positive solution $R_s = r_\#$;

(iii) If $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < \theta_*$, then equation $F(r) = \tilde{\sigma}$ has two positive solutions R_{s1} and R_{s2} satisfying $\gamma < R_{s1} < r_\# < R_{s2}$ with $F'(R_{s1}) > 0$ and $F'(R_{s2}) < 0$.

Note that in case $G(t) \equiv 1$, for $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < 1$, there exists a unique radially symmetric stationary solution. While in case $G(t)$ given by (1.6), we see that for $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < \theta_*$, the problem has two such stationary solutions. Later on, we focus on this interesting case $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < \theta_*$.

Let $c = 0$, for any given function $R(t) \in C^1[0, \infty)$, we solve problem (1.1)–(1.2) and get

$$\sigma(r, t) = (1 - \frac{\gamma}{R(t)}) \frac{R(t) \sinh r}{r \sinh R(t)} H(R(t)). \tag{3.7}$$

By substituting it into (1.3) we reduce the free boundary problem into the following equation

$$\frac{dR}{dt} = \frac{1}{3} \mu [F(R) - \tilde{\sigma}] R. \tag{3.8}$$

Clearly, by classical linearized stability principle of differential equations, we can get the stability of radially stationary solutions. In conclusion, we have

Theorem 3.1 *Let $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < \theta_*$. Free boundary problem (1.1)–(1.6) has two radially symmetric stationary solutions with radius R_{s1} and R_{s2}, ($R_{s1} < R_{s2}$), respectively. In quasi-stationary case $c = 0$, the stationary solution with the larger radius R_{s2} is asymptotically stable and the other smaller one with radius R_{s1} is unstable. More precisely, we have*

$$\lim_{t \to \infty} R(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{for } \ 0 < R_0 < R_{s1}, \\ R_{s2}, & \text{for } \ R_0 > R_{s1}. \end{cases}$$

Remark 3.2 We regard γ as a variable and discuss the effect of Gibbs-Thomson relation on tumor growth. Rewrite $F(r)$, θ_* and R_s as $F(r, \gamma)$, $\theta_*(\gamma)$ and $R_s(\gamma)$, respectively, by regarding them as functions depending on γ. We have

$$\frac{\partial F}{\partial \gamma} = -3 \frac{r \coth r - 1}{r^3} H(r) < 0, \qquad \text{for } \ r > \gamma.$$

It implies that $\theta_*'(\gamma) < 0$ and for $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < \theta_*(\gamma)$, there hold $R_{s1}'(\gamma) > 0$ and $R_{s2}'(\gamma) < 0$. By Theorem 3.1, we see that the radius of the stable radially symmetric stationary solution is decreasing on γ. It implies that increasing cell-to-cell adhesiveness may play a positive role on making tumor more stable.

4 Asymptotic behavior and stability

In this section we study asymptotic behavior of solution $(\sigma(r,t), R(t))$ to free boundary problem (1.1)–(1.6).

First, if the concentration of external nutrient supply is less than the threshold value for apoptosis, the tumor will starve and shrink to zero. More precisely, we have

Theorem 4.1 *If $\tilde{\sigma} > \bar{\sigma}$, then for any $c > 0$ and any given initial data $(\sigma_0(r), R_0)$ satisfying (2.1), we have*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} R(t) = 0.$$

Proof. By Theorem 2.1 we see that there exists a unique global solution $(\sigma(r,t), R(t))$ of free boundary problem (1.1)–(1.6). By (2.4) we have $R(t) \le R_0 \exp(\frac{1}{3}(\bar{\sigma} - \tilde{\sigma})t)$, since $\bar{\sigma} < \tilde{\sigma}$, we obtain that $\lim_{t\to\infty} R(t) = 0$. $\square$

Next we focus on the case $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < \theta_*$ where there exist two radially symmetric stationary solutions denoted by $(\sigma_{s1}(r), R_{s1})$ and $(\sigma_{s2}(r), R_{s2})$, with $R_{s1} < R_{s2}$, respectively.

Let $(\sigma(r,t), R(t))$ is a solution of problem (1.1)–(1.6) with the initial data $(\sigma_0(r), R_0)$ satisfying (2.1). From (3.7), define

$$v(r,t) := (1 - \frac{\gamma}{R(t)})\frac{R(t)\sinh r}{r\sinh R(t)} H(R(t)) \qquad \text{for } 0 < r \le R(t),\ \ t \ge 0. \tag{4.1}$$

We have the following preliminary lemma.

Lemma 4.2 *Let $L > 0$ and $M > 0$. For some $T > 0$, assume that*

$$|R'(t)| \le L \qquad \textit{for } 0 \le t \le T,$$

and

$$|\sigma_0(r) - v(r,0)| \le M \qquad \textit{for } 0 \le r \le R_0.$$

Then there exists a positive constant C depending only on γ such that

$$|\sigma(r,t) - v(r,t)| \le C(Lc + Me^{-\frac{t}{c}}) \qquad \textit{for } 0 \le r \le R(t),\ \ 0 \le t \le T.$$

Proof. By a direct computation,

$$\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} = \frac{R(t)\sinh r}{r\sinh R(t)}\Big\{H(R(t))[\frac{\gamma}{R^2(t)} - R(t)f(R(t))] + (1 - \frac{\gamma}{R(t)})H'(R(t))\Big\}R'(t).$$

Since $rf(r)H(r)$ is bounded on $(0,\infty)$ by (3.4)–(3.6), we see that

$$|\frac{\partial v}{\partial t}| \le CL \qquad \text{for } 0 < r \le R(t),\ \ t \ge 0, \tag{4.2}$$

where C is a constant depending only on γ. Let

$$\sigma_\pm(r,t) = v(r,t) \pm CLc \pm Me^{-\frac{t}{c}}.$$

Then by using (4.2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} c\frac{\partial \sigma_+}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(r^2\frac{\partial \sigma_+}{\partial r}) + \sigma &= c\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} - \Big[\frac{1}{r^2}\frac{\partial}{\partial r}(r^2\frac{\partial v}{\partial r}) - v\Big] - Me^{-\frac{t}{c}} + CLc + Me^{-\frac{t}{c}} \\ &= c\frac{\partial v}{\partial t} + CLc \geq -CLc + CLc \geq 0. \end{aligned}$$

On the other hand, we see that

$$\sigma_+(r,0) = v(r,0) + CLc + M \geq \sigma_0(r) \qquad \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq R_0,$$

and

$$\frac{\partial \sigma_+}{\partial r}(0,t) = 0, \qquad \sigma_+(R(t),t) = G(t) + CLc + Me^{-\frac{t}{c}} > G(t) \qquad \text{for } t \geq 0,$$

where $G(t) = (1-\gamma/R(t))H(R(t))$. Thus by the comparison principle of second order parabolic differential equations, we have

$$\sigma_+(r,t) \geq \sigma(r,t) \qquad \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq R(t),\ \ 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

Similarly, we have

$$\sigma_-(r,t) \leq \sigma(r,t) \qquad \text{for } 0 \leq r \leq R(t),\ \ 0 \leq t \leq T.$$

The desired result follows from the above two inequalities. □

Next, we show that for any given initial data $(\sigma_0(r), R_0)$ satisfying (2.1), the tumor radius $R(t)$ will be bounded for sufficiently small positive c.

Lemma 4.3 *Let K, $\delta > 0$ and initial radius $R_0 > 0$ satisfies one of the following conditions: (i) $\max\{R_0, R_{s2}\} + \delta \leq K$; (ii) $R_0 + \delta \leq K < R_{s1}$. Then there exists a positive constant c_0 depending only on μ, γ, $\tilde{\sigma}$, δ, K such that if $0 < c \leq c_0$, then*

$$R(t) \leq K \qquad \textit{for all} \quad t \geq 0.$$

Proof. (*i*) Let $\max\{R_0, R_{s2}\} + \delta \leq K$. If the assertion is not true, then there exists $t_0 > 0$ such that $R(t) < K$ for $0 \leq t < t_0$ and $R(t_0) = K$. It implies that $R'(t_0) \geq 0$.

By (2.1) we have $|\sigma_0(r) - v(r,0)| \leq \bar{\sigma} = 1$. By (2.3) we easily get that $|R'(t)| \leq L$ for $0 \leq t \leq t_0$, where $L > 0$ depends on μ, $\tilde{\sigma}$ and K. It follows from Lemma 4.2 that

$$|\sigma(r,t) - v(r,t)| \leq C(Lc + e^{-\frac{t}{c}}) \qquad \text{for } \ 0 \leq r \leq R(t),\ \ 0 \leq t \leq t_0.$$

Thus by (1.3) and (3.8) we get

$$\begin{aligned} R'(t) &\leq \frac{\mu}{R^2(t)}\int_0^{R(t)} (v - \tilde{\sigma})r^2 dr + \frac{\mu}{3}C(Lc + e^{-\frac{t}{c}})R(t) \\ &= \frac{\mu}{3}\Big[\Big(F(R(t)) - \tilde{\sigma}\Big)R(t) + C(Lc + e^{-\frac{t}{c}})R(t)\Big]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

Since $R(t_0) = K > R_{s2}$, by (3.5) we see that $F(K) - \tilde{\sigma} < 0$. By taking $t = t_0$ in (4.3), we get that for sufficiently small $c > 0$, there holds $R'(t_0) < 0$. It is a contradiction to $R'(t_0) \geq 0$, and the assertion holds.

(*ii*) For the case $R_0 + \delta \leq K < R_{s1}$, note that we also have $F(K) - \tilde{\sigma} < 0$, by a similar argument with a slight modification, we complete the proof. □

Now we study the stability of radially symmetric stationary solution $(\sigma_{s2}(r), R_{s2})$. We have the following assertion:

Lemma 4.4 *Let $0 < \delta < \min\{R_{s2} - R_{s1}, 1/R_{s2}\}$ and $R_{s1} + \delta < R_0 < 1/\delta$. For a given $\alpha_0 > 0$, there exist constants C, b and c_0 depending on μ, γ, $\tilde{\sigma}$, δ, α_0 such that if $0 < c \leq c_0$: For any $0 < \alpha \leq \alpha_0$, if*

$$|R(t) - R_{s2}| \leq \alpha, \qquad |R'(t)| \leq \alpha, \qquad |\sigma(r,t) - \sigma_{s2}(r)| \leq \alpha$$

hold for all $0 \leq r \leq R(t)$ and $t \geq 0$, then

$$|R(t) - R_{s2}| \leq C\alpha(c + e^{-bt}), \quad |R'(t)| \leq C\alpha(c + e^{-bt}), \quad |\sigma(r,t) - \sigma_{s2}(r)| \leq C\alpha(c + e^{-bt})$$

hold for all $0 \leq r \leq R(t)$ and $t \geq T_0$ for some $T_0 > 0$.

Proof. It is easy to verify that there exists a constant C_0 depending only on γ such that

$$|\sigma_0(r) - v(r,0)| \leq |\sigma_0(r) - \sigma_{s2}(r)| + |v(r,0) - \sigma_{s2}(r)| \leq C_0\alpha.$$

Then by Lemma 4.2 we have

$$|\sigma(r,t) - v(r,t)| \leq C_1\alpha(c + e^{-\frac{t}{c}}) \qquad \text{for } \ 0 \leq r \leq R(t), \ \ t \geq 0,$$

where C_1 is also a constant depending only on γ. Similarly as (4.3), it follows that

$$|R'(t) - \frac{\mu}{3}(F(R(t)) - \tilde{\sigma})R(t)| \leq C_1\alpha\mu R(t)(c + e^{-\frac{t}{c}}) \qquad \text{for } \ t \geq 0. \tag{4.4}$$

By using the inequality $e^{-x} \leq e^{-1}x^{-1}$ for $x > 0$, we have

$$|R'(t) - \frac{\mu}{3}(F(R(t)) - \tilde{\sigma})R(t)| \leq C_2\alpha\mu c R(t) \qquad \text{for } \ t \geq t_0, \tag{4.5}$$

where $t_0 > 0$ and $C_2 = C_1(1 + 1/t_0)$. Take $c < 1$. By (4.4) we also have

$$\begin{aligned} |R'(t)| &\leq \frac{\mu}{3}|F(R(t)) - \tilde{\sigma}|R(t) + 2C_1\alpha\mu R(t) \\ &= \frac{\mu}{3}|F(R(t)) - F(R_{s2})|R(t) + 2C_1\alpha\mu R(t) \\ &\leq C_3\alpha R(t) \qquad \text{for } \ 0 \leq t \leq t_0, \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where $C_3 = 2C_1\mu + \mu \sup_{r>0}\{|F'(r)|/3\}$. Due to $R_{s1} + \delta < R_0 < 1/\delta$, it gives that

$$(R_{s1} + \delta)e^{-C_3\alpha_0 t_0} \leq R_0 e^{-C_3\alpha t_0} \leq R(t_0) \leq R_0 e^{C_3\alpha t_0} \leq \frac{1}{\delta}e^{C_3\alpha_0 t_0}. \tag{4.7}$$

Next, we fix $t_0 > 0$ such that $(R_{s1} + \delta)e^{-C_3\alpha_0 t_0} > R_{s1} + \delta/2$. Consider the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{dR^{\pm}}{dt} = \dfrac{1}{3}\mu R^{\pm}(t)\Big[F(R^{\pm}(t)) - \tilde{\sigma} \pm 3C_2\alpha c\Big] & \text{for } t \geq t_0, \\ R^{\pm}(t_0) = R_0 e^{\pm C_3\alpha t_0}. \end{cases} \tag{4.8}$$

By (3.5) we easily have that there exists $c_0 > 0$ such that for $0 < c \leq c_0$, the equation

$$F(R^{\pm}) - \tilde{\sigma} \pm 3C_2\alpha c = 0 \tag{4.9}$$

has two positive solutions $R^{\pm}_{s1}$ and $R^{\pm}_{s2}$, respectively, and satisfy

$$R^{+}_{s1} < R_{s1} < R^{-}_{s1} < R_{s1} + \delta/2 < R^{-}_{s2} < R_{s2} < R^{+}_{s2},$$

$$F'(R^{\pm}_{s1}) > 0 \qquad \text{and} \qquad F'(R^{\pm}_{s2}) < 0.$$

The constant c_0 is dependent only on μ, γ, $\tilde{\sigma}$, δ and α_0. Besides, by mean value theorem, there exists a positive constant C_4 depending only on γ, $\tilde{\sigma}$, δ and α_0, such that

$$|R^{\pm}_{s2} - R_{s2}| \leq C_4\alpha c. \tag{4.10}$$

Hence for the solutions $R^{\pm}(t)$ of initial value problem (4.8), we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} R^{\pm}(t) = R^{\pm}_{s2}.$$

Moreover, by a similar argument of (A.25) in [3], we can prove that there exist constants $C > 0$, $b > 0$ and $T_0 > t_0$ such that

$$|R^{\pm}(t) - R^{\pm}_{s2}| \leq C_5\alpha e^{-bt} \qquad \text{for } t \geq T_0. \tag{4.11}$$

By (4.5), (4.7) and comparison principle of differential equations, we have

$$R^{-}(t) \leq R(t) \leq R^{+}(t) \qquad \text{for } t \geq T_0. \tag{4.12}$$

From (4.10)–(4.12), we see that there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for $t \geq T_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} |R(t) - R_{s2}| &\leq |R^{+}(t) - R_{s2}| + |R^{-}(t) - R_{s2}| \\ &\leq |R^{+}(t) - R^{+}_{s2}| + |R^{-}(t) - R^{-}_{s2}| + |R^{+}_{s2} - R_{s2}| + |R^{-}_{s2} - R_{s2}| \\ &\leq C\alpha(c + e^{-bt}). \end{aligned}$$

The other two inequalities follow clearly. □

With the above preparations, we now state our main result of asymptotic behavior.

Theorem 4.5 *Let $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < \theta_*$ and the initial data $(\sigma_0(r), R_0)$ satisfy (2.1). Suppose that for some small $\varepsilon > 0$, the initial radius R_0 further satisfies: (i) $0 < R_0 \leq R_{s1} - \varepsilon$; or (ii)*

$R_{s1} + \varepsilon < R_0 < 1/\varepsilon$. Then there exists a positive constant c_0 depending only on μ, γ, $\tilde{\sigma}$ and ε such that if $0 < c \le c_0$ then

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} R(t) = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{in case } (i), \\ R_{s2}, & \text{in case } (ii). \end{cases}$$

Proof. (i) Recall that we have already set $\bar{\sigma} = 1$. Let $K = R_{s1} - \varepsilon/2$ and $\delta = \varepsilon/2$. We have $R_0 + \delta \le K < R_{s1}$. By Lemma 4.3, we see that there exists $c_1 > 0$ such that for any $0 < c \le c_1$, there holds $R(t) \le K$ for $t \ge 0$. By (2.3) we get $|R'(t)| \le \mu|R(t)| \le \mu K$. Thus by using Lemma 4.2 and similarly as (4.3), we have

$$R'(t) \le \frac{\mu}{3}\Big[\Big(F(R(t)) - \tilde{\sigma}\Big)R(t) + C(Kc + e^{-\frac{t}{c}})R(t)\Big] \qquad \text{for } t \ge 0.$$

By (3.5) we see that $F(R(t)) - \tilde{\sigma} \le F(K) - \tilde{\sigma} := -2\eta < 0$. It follows that there exists sufficiently small $c_0 > 0$ such that for $0 < c \le c_0$,

$$R'(t) \le -\mu_0 R(t) \qquad \text{for } t \ge 1, \tag{4.13}$$

where $\mu_0 = \mu\eta/3 > 0$. Hence we have $\lim_{t\to\infty} R(t) = 0$ and moreover, the convergence is exponentially fast.

(ii) Set $K = \max\{R_{s2}, 1/\varepsilon\} + \varepsilon$ and $\delta = \min\{\varepsilon, R_{s2} - R_{s1}, 1/R_{s2}\}$. We see that the conditions of Lemma 4.3 (i) and Lemma 4.4 hold. By Lemma 4.3, there exists $c_2 > 0$ such that for $0 < c \le c_2$, we have $R(t) \le K$ for $t \ge 0$. Then (2.3) implies that $|R'(t)| \le \mu K$. By (2.2), $0 \le \sigma(r,t) \le 1$, we have $|\sigma(r,t) - \sigma_{s2}(r)| \le 1$. Let $\alpha_0 = (1+\mu)K + 1$. By Lemma 4.4, there exist positive constants c_3, b, C and T_0 such that for $0 < c \le c_3$, we have $|R(t) - R_{s2}| \le C\alpha_0(c + e^{-bt}) \le 2Cc\alpha_0$ on $[T_0, \infty)$. Let $c_0 = \min\{c_2, c_3, C/4\}$. Then for $0 < c \le c_0$, we have $|R(t) - R_{s2}| \le 2Cc_0\alpha_0 \le \frac{1}{2}\alpha_0$ on $[T_0, \infty)$. Hence, by iterating this result over the time intervals $[nT_0, \infty)$ (as in [10]) we get the desired assertion. $\square$

Note that by Theorem 4.1, in case $\tilde{\sigma} > \bar{\sigma} = 1$, we have $\lim_{t\to\infty} R(t) = 0$ for all $c > 0$. For the case $\theta_* < \tilde{\sigma} \le 1$, the following result holds:

Corollary 4.6 *Let $\theta_* < \tilde{\sigma} \le 1$. For any given initial data $(\sigma_0(r), R_0)$ satisfying (2.1), there exists a positive constant c_0 depending only on μ, γ, $\tilde{\sigma}$ such that for $0 < c \le c_0$, we have*

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} R(t) = 0.$$

Proof. It is similar to the proof of Theorem 4.5 (i). We just need to notice that in case $\tilde{\sigma} > \theta_*$, $F(R) - \tilde{\sigma} \le \theta_* - \tilde{\sigma} < 0$ for all $R > 0$. $\square$

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we study a free boundary problem modeling tumor growth with Gibbs-Thomson relation, which is based on the hypothesis that tumor cells on the boundary need consume nutrient for providing energy to maintain the compactness, and the consumption is assumed to be measured by $\gamma/R(t)$, where γ is cell-to-cell adhesiveness and $1/R(t)$ represents the mean curvature of tumor boundary with radius $R(t)$ at time t.

An interesting phenomenon induced by Gibbs-Thomson relation is that the model may have two radially symmetric stationary solutions, more precisely, there exists $0 < \theta_* < 1$ depending only on γ, such that for $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < \theta_*$, problem (1.1)–(1.6) has two radially symmetric stationary solutions. It is different from the uniqueness of well-studied tumor models by assuming the concentration of nutrient is continuous across the boundary, cf. [4, 10, 17].

Our analysis shows that in case $0 < \tilde{\sigma} < \theta_*$, for the ratio of the diffusion time scale to the tumor doubling time scale c is sufficiently small, the radially symmetric stationary solution with the larger radius is asymptotically stable, and the other one with the smaller radius is unstable; in case $\tilde{\sigma} > \theta_*$, the tumor will eventually shrink and die for sufficiently small c, especially in case $\tilde{\sigma} > 1$, the tumor will eventually die for all $c > 0$.

Our analysis also implies that the cell-to-cell adhesiveness γ may have a positive effect on stabilizing the tumor growth. The larger cell-to-cell adhesiveness, the smaller value θ_* and radius R_{s2} of the stable stationary solution. It indicates that increasing cell-to-cell adhesiveness may make the tumor eventually converge to a smaller dormant tumor or die more likely. We hope these analysis may be useful for scientific study and clinical treatment of tumors.

Acknowledgement. This work is partially supported by the PAPD of Jiangsu Higher Education Institutions.

References

[1] H. Byrne and M. Chaplain, Growth of nonnecrotic tumors in the presence and absence of inhibitors, *Math. Biosci.*, **130** (1995), 151–181.

[2] H. Byrne and M. Chaplain, Modelling the role of cell-cell adhesion in the growth and development of carcinomas, *Math. Comput. Modelling*, **24** (1996), 1–17.

[3] S. Cui, Analysis of a mathematical model for the growth of tumors under the action of external inhibitors, *J. Math. Biol.*, **44** (2002), 395–426.

[4] S. Cui, Analysis of a free boundary problem modeling tumor growth, *Acta Math. Sinica, English Series*, **21** (2005), 1071–1082.

[5] S. Cui, Asymptotic stability of the stationary solution for a parabolic-hyperbolic free boundary problem modeling tumor growth, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **45** (2013), 2870–2893.

[6] S. Cui and J. Escher, Asymptotic behavior of solutions of a multidimensional moving boundary problem modeling tumor growth, *Comm. Partial Differential Equations*, **33** (2008), 636–655.

[7] A. Friedman, Mathematical analysis and challenges arising from models of tumor growth, *Math. Models Methods Appl. Sci.*, **17** (2007), suppl., 1751–1772.

[8] A. Friedman and B. Hu, Asymptotic stability for a free boundary problem arising in a tumor model *J. Differential Equations*, **227** (2006), 598–639.

[9] A. Friedman and B. Hu, Stability and instability of Liapunov-Schmidt and Hopf bifurcation for a free boundary problem arising in a tumor model, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **360** (2008), 5291–5342.

[10] A. Friedman and F. Reitich, Analysis of a mathematical model for the growth of tumors, *J. Math. Biol.*, **38** (1999), 262–284.

[11] H. P. Greenspan, Models for the growth of a solid tumor by diffusion, *Stud. Appl. Math.*, **52** (1972), 317–340.

[12] J. Lowengrub, H. Frieboes, F. Jin, et al., Nonlinear modelling of cancer: Bridging the gap between cells and tumours, *Nonlinearity*, **23** (2010), R1–R91.

[13] T. Roose, S. Chapman and P. Maini, Mathematical models of avascular tumor growth, *SIAM Review*, **49** (2007), 179–208.

[14] J. Wu, Stationary solutions of a free boundary problem modeling the growth of tumors with Gibbs-Thomson relation, *J. Differential Equations*, **260** (2016), 5875–5893.

[15] J. Wu and S. Cui, Asymptotic stability of stationary solutions of a free boundary modeling the growth of tumors with fluid tissues, *SIAM J. Math. Anal.*, **41** (2009), 391–414.

[16] J. Wu and F. Zhou, Asymptotic behavior of solutions of a free boundary problem modeling the growth of tumors with fluid-like tissue under the action of inhibitors, *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **365** (2013), 4181–4207.

[17] S. Xu, Analysis of a free boundary problem for avascular tumor growth with a periodic supply of nutrients, *Discrete. Conti. Dyn. Syst. Series B*, **21** (2016), 997–1008.

[18] F. Zhou and J. Wu, Stability and bifurcation analysis of a free boundary problem modeling multi-layer tumors with Gibbs–Thomson relation, *European J. Appl. Math.*, **26** (2015), 401–425.